

## **V. REMARKS**

The drawing figures are objected to under 37 CFR 1.84 (p)(5) because they fail to include a reference sign on Page 4, line 1, item "10". The specification is amended as indicated above deleting "10" and, as a result, a drawing correction is no longer required. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The drawing figures 5 and 8 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.84 (p)(5) because they fail to include a reference signs not mentioned in the description. These drawing figures are corrected as indicated above to overcome the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action states that drawing figures 6-8 should be designated by a legend such as "Prior Art". The drawing figures are corrected by incorporating such designation. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The specification is objected to because of informalities. The specification is amended to obviate the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Ishiwata et al. in view of Gerber. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner seems to misunderstand Ishiwata et al. as disclosing all the features of the claimed invention except for the water jet nozzle means. It is respectfully submitted that Applicant respectfully believes that the Examiner misunderstands this reference and that the Examiner's misunderstanding is caused by Figs. 8A-8C, 10A-10C, and/or 12A-12C of Ishiwata et al.

In Figs. 8A-8C, 10A-10C, and 12A-12C of Ishiwata et al., the cutting means is just schematically illustrated so that circular blades are shown as if each of the blades is attached directly to an end of a spindle shaft without any hubs, flanges, nuts etc. used. However, the cutting means should actually have not only circular blades but also hubs, flanges, nuts etc. Please refer to a passage in Ishiwata et al, column 7, lines 59-61, which states: "Each blade 22 or 23 has a flange protruding outward, and the blade is partly encased in a blade cover although not shown in FIG. 811. Also, Applicant would like to refer the Examiner to another passage in Ishiwata et al, column 7, lines 61-63

which states: "In this connection the opposing blade 22 and 23 cannot be put in contact with each other, leaving a minimum space therebetween ... ,."

From the viewpoint above, it should be understood that Ishiwata et al. does not disclose or suggest "the rotary blade mounted with its hub directed inside, leaving no projection outside, thus permitting each cutting blade to face the counter cutting blade without anything intervening in-between," which is a feature in the present invention.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention could not be reached even in reference to any of the prior art references including Ishiwata et al., Gerber, etc., and that it would have been nonobvious at the time the invention was made to person skilled in the art.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the applied art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the features of claim 1 as discussed above. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the features of the applied art because such combination would not result in the claimed invention. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Ishiwata et al. in view of Gerber has applied to claim 1 and further in view of Farnworth et al.. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As indicated above, claim 1 is allowable over Ishiwata and Gerber. Farnworth fails to cure the deficiencies of Ishiwata and Gerber. Thus, claim 1 is allowable over the combination of these references.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features it recites.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.


In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for

allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 11, 2003

By:   
David T. Nikaido  
Reg. No. 22,663

Carl Schaukowitch  
Reg. No. 29,211

**RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC**  
1233 20<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W. Suite 501  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 955-3750  
Fax: (202) 955-3751  
Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s):        Four (4) sheets of Replacement Sheet(s) of Drawings (FIGS. 5-8)  
                             Four (4) sheets of Annotated Sheet(s) of Drawings Showing  
                                         Changes (FIGS. 5-8)

DC132374